

as they can, or a strike in time of a great snow storm or other disaster by employees of the State Roads Commission.

Now, I have been told, Mr. President, by my good friends in the labor movement, that this will never happen, and I say to them, if it will not happen, then this amendment to the amendment will not hurt them in any way.

I believe people have got a right to organize collectively but I do not believe they have got a right to organize against the sovereign State of Maryland.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any delegate desire to ask questions of the sponsor of the amendment?

Delegate Dukes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Malkus, do you yield to a question?

DELEGATE MALKUS: I will be very happy to, Mr. President.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Dukes.

DELEGATE DUKES: Delegate Malkus, do I understand if this language were adopted as an amendment that although it would not authorize employees to strike, neither would it prohibit them from striking?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Malkus.

DELEGATE MALKUS: Delegate Dukes, your question is well taken.

The amendment was written in haste. My intention was that it would prohibit them from striking. That is the intention of the amendment. I would not object to clarification of the amendment to state that they would be prohibited from voting against, or from striking against the State, which was the intention of the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Dukes, do you have a further question?

DELEGATE DUKES: Well, you have answered my question, but you sort of left me in a quandary.

I suppose the only other thing I would say, would it not be wise to state the issue clearly, to put before us your intention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Fox, do you have a question?

DELEGATE FOX: A point of parliamentary inquiry. In view of Delegate Malkus' interpretation of the meaning of

his amendment, I question whether it is in order.

The language just passed says, "subject to such regulations as the General Assembly may prescribe by law, such procedural regulations as the General Assembly may prescribe by law", and I question, is this the proper amendment to that language?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is an addition to the section. I do not know that it is an amendment to that particular language. I am not sure I follow your point.

Why would it not be germane to the section?

DELEGATE FOX: Well, his statement was that he meant this to mean that they could not strike against the State of Maryland.

THE CHAIRMAN: It seems to the Chair that it would not necessarily be inconsistent with the provision that the General Assembly by law would prescribe procedural regulations to provide absolute prohibition in one area. I do not think the amendment is inconsistent with the previous amendment.

Delegate Hardwicke.

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: May I pursue the parliamentary inquiry raised by Delegate Fox?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DELEGATE HARDWICKE: It seems to me if Delegate Malkus' intention is to prohibit a strike, that concept is not consistent with a right to organize and bargain collectively, which is an affirmative right granted already by Amendment No. 21. This is an entirely different concept, is it not, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: The basis of the Chair's ruling is that it does not to the Chair seem inconsistent to state in one section a right to organize and to state in another section, another sentence or clause, that the procedural aspects of that right, or the exercise of that right may be regulated by the General Assembly and to state in another sentence that notwithstanding those provisions, there is a limitation of some sort.

It may be that the way which the three are tied together is grammatically awkward. That would be a question for the Committee on Style. But I do not conceive that it would be impossible to grant a right to organize and then have in effect a proviso that it should not extend to a certain